arXiv:1006.1795v1 [math.PR] 9 Jun 2010

Quenched Central Limit Theorems For Sums of Stationary Processes

Dalibor Volný and Michael Woodroofe
The University of Rouen and The University of Michigan

1 Introduction

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ denote a probability space and $T : \Omega \to \Omega$ an invertible, ergodic measure preserving transformation. Thus, T has a measurable inverse, $\mu[T^{-1}(A)] = \mu(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and the only $A \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $T^{-1}(A) = A$ have measure 0 or 1. If $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is any measurable function, then $X_i = f \circ T^i$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, defines a strictly stationary process. Conversely, any strictly stationary ergodic process can be represented in this form on a sequence space. Suppose that the process $X_i = f \circ T^i$ is adapted to a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $\mathcal{F}_{i+1} = T^{-1}\mathcal{F}_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is always the case with $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma\{X_j : j \le i\}$, but other choices may be more convenient in other examples. Finally, let $\mu(\cdot;\cdot)$ denote a regular conditional probability on $\mathcal{B} = \sigma\{X_1, X_2, \cdots\}$ given $\mathcal{F}_0$, [12], p. $358 - 64$, and write $\mu_\omega = \mu(\omega;\cdot)$; thus, $\mu(\omega;\cdot)$ is a probability measure for each $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\mu(\cdot; B)$ is (a version of) $\mu\{B|\mathcal{F}_0\}$ for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Next, let $U^i g = g \circ T^i$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $g \in L^1(\mu)$, so that $X_i = U^i f$, and let $S_n(f) = X_1 + \cdots + X_n = Uf + \cdots + U^n f$ for $n \ge 1$. If $f \in L^2_0(\mu) = \{g \in L^2(\mu) : \int_\Omega g d\mu = 0\}$, so that $(X_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a centered process with finite variance, then it is natural to ask whether $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n}$ is asymptotically normal as $n \to \infty$. The question has several forms. Let G_n denote the distribution function of $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n}$, $G_n(z) = \mu\{S_n(f)/\sqrt{n} \le z\}$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, and write $G_n(\omega; z) = \mu_\omega\{S_n(f)/\sqrt{n} \le z\}$ for the conditional distribution function given $\mathcal{F}_0$. If G_n converges to a distribution G, say, denoted $G_n \Rightarrow G$, then the convergence is said to be *annealed*. If there is single (non-random) distribution G for which $G_n(\omega;\cdot) \Rightarrow G$ for *a.e.* ω, then the convergence is said to be *quenched* with respect to $\mathcal{F}_0$ or simply $\mathcal{F}_0$-quenched (Derriennic and Lin [6]). There is another possibility in which almost everywhere convergence is replaced by convergence in probability. We will call such convergence *weakly $\mathcal{F}_0$-quenched*. Necessary and sufficient conditions for weakly quenched convergence may be found in [4]

and [16]. Conditions for fully quenched convergence are more delicate, for example [2], [3] and [17].

Interest in quenched limits comes in part from additive functionals of a Markov Chain that does not start in the stationary distribution. For example, in Markov Chain Monte Carlo, the stationary distribution π contains an unknown normalizing constant, and the purpose is to generate random variables having approximately the distribution π. Thus, let $\cdots W_{-1}, W_0, W_1, \cdots$ denote a stationary ergodic Markov Chain with stationary marginal distribution π and consider an additive functional $S_n = g(W_1)+\cdots+g(W_n)$ where $g \in L^2(\pi)$. This is a stationary process and, so, can be represented in the form $X_k = f \circ T^k$ as above. If $\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma\{W_i : i \leq k\}$, then the question of quenched convergence is equivalent to asking whether the conditional distribution of $S_n/\sqrt{n}$ given $W_0 = w$ converges for *a.e.* w (π).

Denote the norm in $L^p(\mu)$ by $\|\cdot\|_p$; write E for both expectation and conditional expectation with respect to μ; and let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of $\mathcal{F}_0$ measurable $g \in L^2(\pi)$ for which $E(Ug|\mathcal{F}_0) = 0$. $\mathcal{M}$ is called the *martingale difference space* because $U^i g, i \in \mathbb{Z}$, are martingale differences for any $g \in \mathcal{M}$. An $f \in L^2(\mu)$ is said to admit an L^p co-boundary if there is an $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and a $g \in L^p(\mu)$ for which $f = m + g - Ug$. It is known that the existence of an L^1 co-boundary implies the annealed version the the Central Limit Theorem and the existence of an L^2 co-boundary the quenched version. In Theorem 2 we show that the existence of an L^1 co-boundary does not imply the quenched version. In Theorem 1 it is shown that the condition (1) introduced by Hannan [8] implies that the conditional distributions of $\{S_n - E(S_n|\mathcal{F}_0)\}/\sqrt{n}$ converge to a normal distribution $w.p.1$.

2 The Martingale Case

Much of the recent progress on the central limit question for sums of stationary processes has relied on approximation by martingales. So, the case in which $S_n(f)$ is a martingale is considered first. Some preparation is necessary. Recall that if $g \in L^1(\mu)$, then $U^n g/n \to 0$ $w.p.1$ by the Pointwise Ergodic Theorem (since $U^n g = S_n(g) - S_{n-1}(g)$). So, if $g \in L^2(\mu)$, then $U^n g/\sqrt{n} \to 0$ $w.p.1$. Next, recall Mc Leish's conditions for the Martingale Central Limit Theorem [13], as refined by Lachout [11]: Let $X_{n,j}, 1 \leq j \leq n$, be martingale differences defined on a probability space $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{A}_n, P_n)$ for each n. If

(i) $\sum_{j=1}^n X_{n,j}^2 \to^{P_n} \sigma^2$,

(ii) $\forall\ \epsilon > 0,\ P_n[\max_{j\leq n} |X_{n,j}| \geq \epsilon] \to 0$,

(iii) $\sup_{n\geq 1} E_n[\max_{j\leq n} X_{n,j}^2] < \infty$,

then $X_{n,1}+\cdots+X_{n,n} \Rightarrow \text{Normal}[0, \sigma^2]$ (that is, the distribution function of the sum converges

weakly to the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2.) Lachout [11] showed that (ii) and (iii) could be replaced by

(iv) $E_n[\max_{j\le n}|X_{n,j}|]\to 0$.

Lemma 1 *If $X_{n,j}=f\circ T^j/\sqrt{n}$, where $f\in L^2(\mu)$, then (iv) holds.*

Proof. Since $f\in L^2(P)$, it is clear that $\lim_{n\to\infty}U^nf/\sqrt{n}=0$ $w.p.1$ (μ) and, therefore, that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{j\le n}|U^jf|/\sqrt{n}=0$ $w.p.1.$ (μ_ω) for $a.e.$ ω. Let

$$X^*=\sup_{n\ge 1}\max_{1\le j\le n}|X_{n,j}|\quad\text{and}\quad f^*=\sup_{n\ge 1}\sqrt{\frac{f^2\circ T+\cdots+f^2\circ T^n}{n}}.$$

Then $X^*\le f^*$ clearly, and $\mu\{f^*>\lambda\}\le\|f\|_2^2/\lambda^2$ for $\lambda>0$, by the Maximal Ergodic Theorem, [1], p. 318. So, $f^*\in L^1(\mu)$ and, therefore, $X^*\in L^1(\mu_\omega)$ for $a.e.$ ω. Condition (iv) then follows from the Dominated Convergence Theorem, applied conditionally. ♢

Proposition 1 *If $f\in\mathcal{M}$, then $G_n(\omega;\cdot)$ converges to the normal distribution with mean* 0 *and variance $\|f\|_2^2$ for $a.e.$ ω.*

Proof. Equivalent results are established in [10], [15], and [16], but are not isolated there. A proof is included here for completeness. Our proof, at least, differs from the arguments of [10], [15], and [16]. Let $X_{n,j}=U^jf/\sqrt{n}$, $1\le j\le n$. Then $X_{n,j}$ are martingale differences with respect to μ_ω for $a.e.$ ω, by the smoothing property of conditional expectation, [1], p. 448. So, it suffices to show that (i) and (iv) hold with $P_n=\mu_\omega$ for $a.e.$ ω. That (iv) is satisfied was shown in Lemma 1. For (i), it follows directly from the Pointwise Ergodic Theorem that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n X_{n,j}^2=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n U^jf^2\to\|f\|_2^2,$$

$w.p.1$ (μ) and, therefore, $w.p.1$ (μ_ω) for $a.e.$ ω (μ). So, (i) is satisfied for the measures μ_ω for $a.e.$ ω. ♢

Corollary 1 *If f admits a L^2-coboundary, say $f=m+g-Ug$, where $m\in\mathcal{M}$ and and $g\in L^2(\mu)$, then $G_n(\omega;\cdot)\Rightarrow\text{Normal}[0,\|m\|_2^2]$ for $a.e.$.*

Proof. Since $S_n(f)=S_n(m)+Ug-U^{n+1}g=S_n(m)+o(\sqrt{n})$ $w.p.1$, the corollary follows from Slutzky's Theorem, applied conditionally. ♢

3 Hannan's Theorem

Write $E^i(g) = E(g|\mathcal{F}_i)$ and $P_i g = E^i(g) - E^{i-1}(g)$ for $g \in L^1(\mu)$ and observe that the restrictions of each E^i and P_i are projections on $L^2(\mu)$. Hannan [8] has shown that if $f \in L^2(\mu)$ is $\mathcal{F}_0$ measurable, $E(f|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}) = 0$, and

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{0} \|P_i f\|_2 < \infty, \tag{1}$$

then $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow \text{Normal}[0, \|m\|_2^2]$, where $m = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P_0 U^i f$. Volný and Woodroofe [14] show by example that the convergence need not be quenched. However,

Theorem 1 *If $f \in L_0^2(\mu)$ is $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable, $E(f|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}) = 0$ and $\sum_{i\le 0} \|P_i f\|_2 < \infty$, then the conditional distribution of $\{S_n(f) - E^0[S_n(f)]\}/\sqrt{n}$ given $\mathcal{F}_0$ converges to a normal distribution w.p.1.*

Proof. The easily verified relations $E^i(U^j f) = U^j E_{i-j} f$ and $P_i(U^j f) = U^j P_{i-j} f$ are used in the proof. Letting $g_n = P_0 U^{-1} S_n(f)$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(f) - E^0[S_n(f)] &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} P_j[S_n(f) - S_{j-1}(f)] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} P_j U^{j-1} S_{n-j+1}(f) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} U^j g_{n-j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\frac{S_n(f) - E^0[S_n(f)]}{\sqrt{n}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_{n,j},$$

where $Y_{n,j} = U^j g_{n-j+1}/\sqrt{n}$. The $Y_{n,j}$ are martingale differences, since $E^{j-1}[U^j g_{n-j+1}] = U^j E^{-1} g_{n-j+1} = 0$. So, it suffices to show that conditions (i) and (iv) of Proposition 1 hold $w.p.1$ (μ). That (iv) is satisfied follows from Lemma 1. For (i) first observe that $|g_n| \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |P_0 U^k f| = h$, say, and $\|h\|_2 \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|P_0 U^k f\| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|P_{-k} f\|$, which is finite by assumption. So, g_n converges to $m = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P_0 U^k f$ $w.p.1$ and in $L^2(P)$, $E[\sup_{n\ge 1} |g_n|^2] < \infty$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_{n,j}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (U^j g_{n-j+1})^2 \to \|m\|_2^2 \ w.p.1 \ (\mu)$$

by (a simple application of) the The Pointwise Ergodic Theorem. See Lemma 2 below. $\diamondsuit$

Lemma 2 *If g_n are measurable, $g_n \to g$ a.e., and $\sup_{n\ge 1} |g_n|$ is integrable, then*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} U^k g_{n-k+1} \to \int_{\Omega} g dP \ w.p.1.$$

Proof. There is no loss of generality in supposing that $g = 0$. Let $h_m = \sup_{n \geq m} |g_n|$. Then $U^n h_1 = o(n)$ $w.p.1$, since h_1 is integrable, and

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} U^k g_{n-k+1} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} U^k h_m + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} U^{n-k+1} h_1 \to \int_\Omega h_m dP$$

for any $m \geq 1$. The lemma follows since the right side may be made arbitrarily small by taking m sufficiently large. $\diamondsuit$

A result equivalent to Theorem 1 appears in [3]; the two results were obtained independently.

4 Co-boundaries

In this section it is shown that the existence of an L^1 co-boundary does not imply the quenched version of the central limit theorem. The same construction shows that a condition suggested by Heyde [9] does not imply quenched convergence.

Theorem 2 *There is a dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$, an $f \in L^2_0(\mu)$, and a $g \in L^1(\mu)$ for which:*

(a) $f = g - Ug$;

(b) $\limsup_{n\to\infty} E^0[S_n(f)]/\sqrt{n} \geq 1$ $w.p.1$;

Proof. Let $\ell_1, \ell_2, \cdots$ and $M_1, M_2, \cdots$ be strictly increasing sequences of positive integers for which

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{k\ell_k}} + \ell_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{M_{k-1}}{M_k}} \right] < \infty. \tag{2}$$

If (2) holds for M_k then it also holds with M_k replaced by $M_k \vee 2\ell_k$, and we will suppose that $M_k \geq 2\ell_k$ for all k. Let e_k be random variables for which $U^i e_k = e_k \circ T^i, i \in \mathbb{Z},\ k \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent,

$$e_k = \pm \frac{\sqrt{M_k}}{\ell_k} \text{ with probability } \frac{1}{2kM_k}$$

each, and $e_k = 0$ otherwise; and let $\mathcal{F}_j = \sigma\{U^i e_k : i \leq j,\ k \geq 1\}$. Observe that $\|e_k\|_1 = 1/k\ell_k\sqrt{M_k}$ and $\|e_k\|_2^2 = 1/k\ell_k^2$ for $k \geq 1$. If ℓ_k is any sequence for which $1/\sqrt{k\ell_k}$ summable, then (2) holds with $M_0 = 1$ and $M_k = k\ell_k^5 M_{k-1}$ for $k \geq 1$.

To construct f and g and verify (a), first let $N_k = M_1 + \cdots + M_k$ and observe that $N_{k-1} \leq kM_{k-1} = o(M_k)$ as $k \to \infty$ by (2), so that $N_k \sim M_k$. Next, let $h_k = e_k + \cdots + U^{\ell_k - 1} e_k$, and

$$f_k = h_k - U^{\ell_k} h_k = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell_k - 1} U^i e_k - \sum_{i=\ell_k}^{2\ell_k - 1} U^i e_k. \tag{3}$$

Then $\|f_k\|_2^2 = 2\ell_k\|e_k\|^2 = 2/k\ell_k$. So, $\|f_k\|_2$ is summable by (2) and, therefore, $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U^{-N_k} f_k \in L^2(\mu)$. Next, let $g_k = h_k + \cdots + U^{\ell_k - 1} h_k$. Then $g_k - Ug_k = h_k - U^{\ell_k} h_k = f_k$, and $\|g_k\|_1 \leq \ell_k \|h_k\|_1 \leq \ell_k^2 \|e_k\|_1 = \ell_k / k\sqrt{M_k}$, which is also summable by (2). So, $g = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U^{-N_k} g_k \in L^1(\mu)$ and $f = g - Ug$, establishing (a). For later reference, observe that $S_n(f) = Ug - U^{n+1} g$ and

$$g_k = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell_k - 1} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell_k - 1} U^{i+j} e_k = \sum_{r=0}^{2\ell_k - 2} c_{k,r} U^r e_k, \tag{4}$$

where $c_{k,r} = (r+1)$ for $0 \leq r \leq \ell_k - 1$ and $c_{k,r} = (2\ell_k - 1 - r)$ for $\ell_k \leq r \leq 2\ell_k - 2$.

To verify (b) first observe that $E^0(U^n g) = I(n) + II(n)$, where

$$I(n) = \begin{cases} U^{n - N_k} g_k & \text{if } N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k - 2\ell_k + 2 \\ \sum_{i=0}^{N_k - n} c_{k,i} U^{i + n - N_k} e_k & \text{if } N_k - 2\ell_k + 2 < n \leq N_k \end{cases}$$

and

$$II(n) = \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} U^{n - N_j} g_j$$

for $N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k$. It will be shown that

$$P\left[\max_{N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k} I(n) \geq (1 - \epsilon)\sqrt{N_k}, \text{ i.o.} \right] = 1 \tag{5}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$ and

$$P\left[\max_{N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k} II(n) \neq 0 \text{ i.o} \right] = 0. \tag{6}$$

Assertion (b) then follows from $E^0[S_n(f)] = Ug - E^0[U^{n+1} g]$.

To establish (5), let A_n be the event that $U^{n + \ell_k - 1 - N_k} e_k = \sqrt{M_k}/\ell_k$ and $U^{n + i - N_k} e_k = 0$ for $0 \leq i \neq \ell_k - 1 \leq 2\ell_k - 2$ for $N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k$. If $\epsilon > 0$, then

$$\bigcup_{n = N_{k-1} + 1}^{N_k - 2\ell_k + 2} A_n \subseteq \left\{ \max_{N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k} I_k(n) \geq (1 - \epsilon)\sqrt{N_k} \right\},$$

for all large k, since $N_k \sim M_k$. Then from (2) and the Bonferoni Inequalities, [7], p. 100

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\bigcup_{n = N_{k-1} + 1}^{N_k - 2\ell_k + 2} A_n \right) &\geq \sum_{n = N_{k-1} + 2}^{N_k - 2\ell_k + 2} P(A_n) - \sum_{n = N_{k-1} + 1}^{N_k - 2\ell_k + 2} \sum_{m = N_{k-1} + 1}^{n-1} P(A_m \cap A_n) \\ &\geq (N_k - N_{k-1} - 2\ell_k + 2) \left(\frac{1}{2kM_k} \right) \left[1 - \frac{1}{kM_k} \right]^{2\ell_k - 2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(N_k - N_{k-1} - 2\ell_k)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2kM_k} \right)^2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{kM_k} \right]^{2\ell_k - 2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2k} + o(\frac{1}{k}). \end{aligned}$$

That (5) holds, then follows from the Borel Cantelli Lemmas, since the events $\cup_{n=N_{k-1}+1}^{N_k-2\ell_k+2} A_n$ are independent.

For (6) simply observe that

$$P\left[\max_{N_{k-1}<n\le N_k} |U^{n-N_j} g_j| \ge 0\right] \le \sum_{i=N_{k-1}-N_j+1}^{N_k-N_j+2\ell_j} P\left[U^i e_j \ne 0\right] = \frac{N_k - N_{k-1} + 2\ell_j}{jM_j}$$

for $j > k$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{N_k - N_{k-1} + 2\ell_j}{jM_j}\right) \le \sum_{j=2}^{\infty}\frac{N_{j-1} + 2j\ell_j}{jM_j},$$

which is finite (2). So, (6) also follows from the Borel Cantelli Lemmas. ♢

Recall that $\mathcal{M}$ denotes the martingale difference space. Recall too the Convergence of Types Theorem, [12], p. 203: *Let $a_n > 0$, $b_n \in \mathbb{R}$, and let Y_n be a random variables. If $Y_n \Rightarrow Y$, and $a_n Y_n + b_n \Rightarrow Z$, where Y has a non-degenerate distribution, then $a = \lim_{n\to\infty} a_n$ and $b = \lim_{n\to\infty} b_n$ exist, and $Z =^{Dist} aY + b$.*

Corollary 2 *If $m \in \mathcal{M}$, then $S_n(m+f)/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow \text{Normal}[0, \|m\|_2^2]$, but the convergence is not quenched.*

Proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{S_n(m+f)}{\sqrt{n}} &= \frac{S_n(m)}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{S_n(f) - E^0(S_n(f))}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{E^0(S_n(f))}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &= Y_{n,1} + Y_{n,2} + \nu_n,\end{aligned}$$

say, and observe that ν_n is $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable. By Proposition 1 the conditional distribution of $Y_{n,1}$ given $\mathcal{F}_0$ converges to Normal$[0, \|m\|^2]$. In this case$Y_{n,2}\{S_n(f) - E^0[S_n(f)]\}/\sqrt{n}$ and $\mathcal{F}_0$ are independent. So, the conditional distribution of $Y_{n,2}$ is the same as its unconditional distribution which converges to the degenerate distribution at 0 by part (a) of the Theorem. It follows that the conditional distribution of $Y_n = Y_{n,1} + Y_{n,2}$ converges to the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\|m\|_2^2$. That the conditional distribution of $S_n(m+f)/\sqrt{n}$ does not converge to Normal$[0, \|m\|^2]$ then follows from the Convergence of Types Theorem in the case $m \ne 0$. If $m = 0$, then $G_n(\omega; z) = F_n[z - n^{-\frac{1}{2}} E^0(S)(\omega)]$, where F_n denotes the uncondtional distribution of Y_n. It then follows from (b) that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} G_n(\omega; z) = 0$ for $0 < z < 1/2$. ♢

Heyde [9] showed that the CLT is true under a slightly weaker condition than Hannan's,

$$m = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} P_0 U^i f \quad \text{and} \quad \|m\|_2^2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{E[S_n(f)^2]}{n}. \tag{7}$$

The last corollary shows that the f constructed in Theorem 2 satisfies (7), so that (7) does not imply quenched convergence either. That (7) does not imply the weak invariance principle was shown in [5]

Corollary 3 *If $\ell_k = 2^k$, then the f constructed in Theorem 2 satisfies (7) with $m = 0$.*

Proof. Since f is $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable, the sum on the left side of (7) is $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_0 S_n(f)$. If $n \geq 1$ then, using (4),

$$P_0 U^{n-N_k} g_k = \begin{cases} c_{k,N_k-n} e_k & \text{if } N_k - 2\ell_k + 2 < n \leq N_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let $k = k_n$ be the unique integer for which $N_{k-1} < n \leq N_k$. Then $S_n(f) = P_0 U^{n-N_k} g_{N_k}$ and $\|P_0 S_n(f)\|_2^2 \leq 2\ell_k^2 \|e_k\|_2^2 = 2/k \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus the sum converges to $m = 0$.

For the second part of (7), observe that

$$g_k - U^n g_k = \sum_{r=0}^{n\wedge\ell_k-1} U^r h_k - \sum_{r=n\vee\ell_k-1}^{n+\ell_k-1} U^r h_k.$$

So,

$$S_n(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U^{-N_k} \left[\sum_{r=0}^{n\wedge\ell_k-1} U^r h_k \right] - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U^{-N_k} \left[\sum_{r=n\vee\ell_k-1}^{n+\ell_k-1} U^r h_k \right]$$

$$\|S_n(f)\|_2^2 \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{r=0}^{n\wedge\ell_k-1} U^r h_k \right\|^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{r=n\vee\ell_k-1}^{n+\ell_k-1} U^r h_k \right\|_2^2$$

and, therefore,

$$\|S_n(f)\|_2^2 \leq 4 \sum_{\ell_k \leq n} \frac{\ell_k^3}{k\ell_k^2} + 4 \sum_{\ell_k > n} \frac{n^2 \ell_k}{k\ell_k 2} = 4 \sum_{\ell_k \leq n} \frac{\ell_k}{k} + 4 \sum_{\ell_k > n} \frac{n^2}{k\ell_k}.$$

Suppose now that $\ell_k = 2^k$ and let $m_n = \log_2(n)$. Then the last term is at most

$$\sum_{k \leq \frac{1}{2}m_n} 2^k + \frac{2}{m_n} \sum_{k \leq m_n} 2^k \leq 2^{\frac{1}{2}m_n} + \frac{2}{m_n} 2^{m_n} + n^2 \sum_{k > m_n} \frac{1}{k2^k} = o(n),$$

as required in (7). ♢

The proofs of Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 have been adapted and simplified from [5]

References

[1] Billingsley, Patrick (1995). *Probability and Measure*. Wiley

[2] Cuny, Christophe (2009). Pointwise ergodic theorems with rate and application to limit theorems for stationary processes. arXiv:0904.0185v1.

[3] Cuny, C. and M. Peligrad (2009). The central limit theorem started at a point for additive functionals of reversible Markov Chains.

[4] Dedecker, J. and F. Merlevède (2002). *Necessary and sufficient conditions for the conditional central limit theorem. Ann. Prob.*, **30**, 1044-1081.

[5] Dedecker, J., F. Merlevède, and D. Volný (2007). On the weak invariance principle for non-adapted sequences under projective criteria. *J. Theor. Probab.*, **20**, 971-1004.

[6] Derriennic, Y. and M. Lin (2001). The central limit theorem for Markov Chains with normal transition operators started at a point. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **119**, 508-528.

[7] Feller, W. (1968). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*. WIley.

[8] Hannan, E.J. (1973). Central limit theorems for time series regression. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeithstheorie verw. Geb.*, **26**,157-170.

[9] Heyde, C. (1975). On the central limit theorem and iterated logarithm law for stationary processes. *Aust. Math. Bull.*, **12**, 1-8.

[10] Kipnis, C. and S.R.S. Varadhan (1986). Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusion. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **104**, 1-19.

[11] Lachout, P. (1985). A note on the martingale central limit theorem. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, **26**, 637-640.

[12] Loève, M. (1963). *Probability Theory*. Van Nostrand.

[13] Mc Leish, D.L. (1974). Dependent central limit theorem and invariance principals. *Ann. Prob.*, **2**, 620-628.

[14] Volný, D. and M. Woodroofe (2009). An example of non-quenched convergence for partial sums of a linear process. Submitted.

[15] Woodroofe, M. (1992). A central limit theorem for functions of a Markov chain with applications to shifts. *Stoc. Proc. Appl.*, **41**, 33-44.

[16] Wu, W. and M. Woodroofe (2004). Martingale approximations for sums of stationary processes. *Ann. Prob.*, **32**, 1674-1690.

[17] Zhao, Ou and M. Woodroofe (2008). Law of the iterated logarithm for stationary processes. *Ann. Prob.*, **36**, 127-142.